

BLADE GRASS BLADE.

A. T. Parker
High and Ashland East Side

EDITED BY A HEATHEN IN THE INTEREST OF GOOD MORALS.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY. ONE DOLLAR A YEAR IN ADVANCE.

VOLUME XIV. NUMBER 35

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY SUNDAY, NOV. 19, 1905

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR IN ADVANCE



Charles L. Moore
Editor



TERMS OF THE BLADE.
I issue for one year \$1.00.
In clubs of five NEW subscribers, 50 cents each, \$2.50 for five.
Terms—\$1.00 per year, in advance; foreign subscribers, \$1.50.
Five new subscribers sent one year for \$2.50.
Make all Money Orders, Drafts and Express Orders payable to the Blade Grass Blade, Lexington, Ky.
When you change your address advise this office, giving your old as well as the new address.
When you send your subscription say whether you send a new or old subscriber.
Office of publication—100 West 1st St., Lexington, Kentucky.
Entered at the post office at Lexington, Ky. as Second Class Mail Matter.
Address all communications to 292 GRASS BLADE, P. O. BOX, 393 Lexington—Kentucky.
Fayette Telephone, 619.
Cumberland Telephone, 307.
If your subscription is due we wish you would please remit and save us the postage of notifying you.
Josephine K. Henry's pamphlet, "Woman and the Bible" is meeting with warm commendation. It is now circulating in all sections of the United States, and orders for it have been received from England, Scotland, Germany and Sweden. As the edition is being rapidly exhausted persons desiring copies of this pamphlet should write to JOSEPHINE K. HENRY, Versailles, Ky., and they will be sent as soon as the edition lasts.
Josephine K. Henry is writing a pamphlet on "Marriage and Divorce" and will soon be ready for press. It is now circulating in all sections of the United States, and orders for it have been received from England, Scotland, Germany and Sweden. As the edition is being rapidly exhausted persons desiring copies of this pamphlet should write to JOSEPHINE K. HENRY, Versailles, Ky., and they will be sent as soon as the edition lasts.
The price of this pamphlet will be announced later in the Blade.
Mollie, Kansas—Dear Old Friend:—It is with a heavy heart that I write to you for the first time in many years. I hope you are better, and that you will get well again. It seems as though we can't spare you from our great cause. Give Dr. Wilson and Mrs. Hughes my kind wishes and special regards to Mrs. Moore. I sympathize with her. Hoping for the best, I remain your friend.—ELLA P. HUNT.

order to make his example an instance of pulpit contempt. They would like to be able to discredit him among his own class, and then damn and keep damning him themselves, forever after; for he assured they would be the last ones ever to say a good word for Charles Moore. All they want is to make an example of him in order to strengthen their own false teachings. In reference to this declaration of the Rev. Small, Mr. Moore makes this statement:

HAS NOT CONE BACK TO CHURCH

REPORT THAT EDITOR MOORE
HAD REPUDIATED INFIDELITY
UNFOUNDED.

Announcement Made in a Local Church Provokes A Denial—Mistake May Have Grown Out of Card in Which Forgiveness of Any Whom He May Have WRONGED Is Asked.

In his discourse at the Broadway Christian Church yesterday morning Mr. Small, the evangelist, stated that he understood Mr. C. C. Moore, editor of the Blade Grass Blade and noted as an infidel, had professed faith in the church, and asked the Lord to forgive him for his error and his unbelief. Mr. Moore was years ago a minister of the Christian Church. For some weeks he has been seriously ill of heart trouble. "Quarantined" at his home on the Huffman Mill place, he was much better yesterday, but was not able to come to the telephone when called by a Herald reporter. Mrs. Moore stated that the report that Mr. Moore had repudiated infidelity and embraced the church was wholly unfounded, and asked that a correction be published.—Lexington Herald.

Comment—Surely there is nothing in the above letter which should lead Evangelist Small to state that Mr. Moore has "professed faith in the church, and asked the Lord to forgive him for his error and his unbelief." Small does not say that he "knew" this to be true, but that he "understood" it to be true. It is very evident that his intention was to set a heinous rumor afloat, knowing that it would be taken up, and accepted as a fact, and shows what a small man Small is.

For twenty years, Mr. Moore has been challenging preachers tall and small, to debate with him, either orally, or in print, offering the columns of his paper to them, and none of them would dare meet him, and all treated him with contempt, personally and intellectually. In the days of his health and intellectual vigor, they dared not thus meet him. Now, that mind and body are weakened by disease, and probably death, impending, preachers and praying people would take advantage of his feeble condition to startle about him. This goes to prove what I have said in another column. It is never safe to let preachers on their emblems in the sick room of a Freethinker. If the Freethinker is a man of prominence, 50 out of a hundred will go away and lie about him and misrepresent him. None of them care for Mr. Moore's soul. All they want is the chance to make his name forever infamous, as they have tried to do with Paine's. They have told ten million lies about Thomas Paine, passing them on from generation to generation. Keep the verbiage out.

Mr. Moore, in the past, has often been very vindictive in speaking of the clergy, and has not been free of indulging in unnecessary personal abuse. But he has to his credit, that he did not wait until they were dying or dead to take advantage of them. Now that he is seriously sick, he shows evidence that he regrets many of his harsh utterances, some of which were provoked by the Christian attempts to deprive him of his liberty. It is becoming in Mr. Moore to regret that he has often spoken as harshly, and that he forgives and wishes to be forgiven. This is both liberal and manly; but why should Small or any one else conclude that it is a profession of faith in the church, and an expression of repentance for error and unbelief?

His shows upon what a slight influence, the clergy can build a prodigious rumor or lie.

None of the Kentucky clergy, not one of them raised their voices in Mr. Moore's behalf when he was sent to the Ohio State Prison. None of them made an effort to get him out. None of them welcomed him home. They cared nothing for him then. What do they care for him now? except that they would like for him to recant, while in his irresponsible condition, in

order to make his example an instance of pulpit contempt. They would like to be able to discredit him among his own class, and then damn and keep damning him themselves, forever after; for he assured they would be the last ones ever to say a good word for Charles Moore. All they want is to make an example of him in order to strengthen their own false teachings. In reference to this declaration of the Rev. Small, Mr. Moore makes this statement:

"An Evangelist named Small, now conducting a protracted meeting at the Broadway Christian Church in Lexington, I am told, announced in the pulpit the other day that I had joined the church. I do not know anything about him. Of course those interested in me will soon find out that it is not true."

The above is not after Mr. Moore's old time style in replying to clerical lies. It is positive enough. Mrs. Moore has sent me word through Mr. Hughes, that Mr. Moore is under the influence of opiates a large part of the time, and of course, is not in his normal mental condition, and not to believe anything read about his recanting or repenting, and to defend him against all such statements.

I hope Mrs. Moore will have good judgment to keep not only the clergy, but all others who would influence Mr. Moore at this time, when his mind is under the influence of opiates, away from him. Otherwise, for the next fifty years, his good name and character will be traduced in Christian pulpits, for all that is blasphemous, corrupt and bad, through all the period of his best manhood; and all the good they will ever say of him will be that he recanted, repented of his error, and had to come to Jesus at last.

This one Small straw shows the direction of the divine mind. J. B. W.

NEWSPAPERS

UGHT TO QUIT LYING ABOUT
MR. MOORE.

Some time ago an Associated Press dispatch, in telling of Mr. Moore's illness, among other things stated that he was sent to prison for advocating free love, which is a malicious lie, and the reporter who gave that out knew he was lying.

Last Sunday the New York World and St. Louis Post Dispatch each carried a picture of Mr. Moore and a lengthy account of his sickness and history of his life, and they, too, state that Mr. Moore "finally took up free love" and was arrested for the same. This article, no doubt was sent out from Lexington, and is inexcusable on the part of the reporter, for every one around Lexington ought to know by this time that Mr. Moore has been the most vindictive writer usually the principle of free love of any man in the country. The mere mention of the name free love was like waving a red flag in the face of an angry bull. He has been so dead set against free love that he became more and more cranky in discussing it. The most vituperative language at his command has been employed against not only the principle, but against his friends who learned toward that principle.

In discussing the subject no one could be more bitterly set against free love, or more harrow, dogmatic or bigoted in his opposition to it, than he. This the Lexington reporters ought to know. Then, why do they set about the falsehood that Mr. Moore is an advocate of free love, and that he was sent to prison for sending obscene literature through the mails? Every newspaper mention of Mr. Moore is sure to mention his prison record, and give out the impression that his imprisonment was just, and based upon the scattering of obscene literature, when every one in Lexington knows that the real cause of his imprisonment was an attempt to stop his paper, and was a blow at Free Thought and free speech. They know that Mr. Moore's reputation on his return home by the citizens of Lexington was a refutation of that illegal and vindictive attempt to crush free speech.

The newspapers ought to quit lying about Mr. Moore, for this simple reason, they ought to be ashamed that in this late day of the world's civilization, and that in this boasted civilization of ours, under a constitution guaranteeing equal rights to all, that any man should be sent to prison for expressing his honest opinions about any principle affecting the widely varied

social conditions of humanity. Every man should have the right to say what he honestly thinks about any matter affecting the social order, politics, religion, education, economy, marital or bond love, or free love. He should have liberty to speak for or against and subject affecting his own nature or happiness, or that of society at large. How else can we arrive at the truth of things without the fullest open and free discussion?

The commitment of Mr. Moore to prison was not due to the advocacy of free love, or mailing obscene literature, but a blow at free speech; and newspapers ought to quit lying about that conspiracy against liberty, because they ought to be ashamed of it.

No doubt when Mr. Moore passes away, there will be an immense lot lying fallow. It wouldn't surprise us, if they will have him back in the Campbell field. At the present time, he has to have a hypodermic injection of morphine every five or six hours. He has not lain down for four weeks, and is compelled to sit and sleep in a rocker. Being under the influence of morphine all the time, he of course is not responsible at any time, and wasn't been for four weeks. I am satisfied, that in this irresponsible condition, attempts are being made to get him back into the ranks of the superstition, which for so many years, he has fought with all the might and power of his intellectual manhood. Women and preachers are writing him letters, they are praying for him, and are going to his house and praying for him there.

The time for them to have prayed for him, was in the days of his intellectual vigor, and not when body and brain are weakened by disease and his mind is under the influence of opiates. Mr. Moore is a man who is easily moved by any little personal show of kindness, and will be even more so, while under the influence of morphine. If his weakness of mind is such that he is susceptible of being honest, or not, it will result in causing a vigorous defense being made, by Mr. Moore's liberal friends, who will see to it that such injustice shall not be done his memory. A perfectly healthy young man, to whom morphine is given every five or six hours, would not be responsible for half he would say, after two or three days.

Therefore, Mr. Moore's liberal record must be based upon his responsible moments in the days of health and intellectual vigor.

Knowing the Christian influence and intimidation brought upon Paine to induce him to recant, when he was weak and racked with disease, I wouldn't surprise me if the same such influence would be brought to bear on Mr. Moore. There are people who would not hesitate to take advantage of Mr. Moore's lack of responsibility at this time, if they thought they could gain some pulpit thunder by it. They care nothing for Mr. Moore, or for his soul,—their only desire being to make his memory infamous, as they did Paine's, and make him the butt of their pulpit contempt. They would gleefully gloat over the irresponsible utterances of a dying man, whose brain is stupefied with opiates. The wise thing for Mr. Moore and family to do is to admit all good Christian neighbors, for no doubt many of them are good and kind people, even if they are misguided by religious belief; but keep the theological and praying business out, and allow no advantage taken of Mr. Moore's mental helplessness. This is just what I have ordered in case of any serious sickness. I want no preachers or praying people about me, to make sure that in case of my irresponsibility from disease, I will not be taken advantage of and lied about. All such should be kept out, and no risks taken. In justice to the labor and sacrifices and sincerity of Mr. Moore in the cause of Free Thought for twenty long years, in which time he employed the powers of his intellectual manhood in fighting the Christian superstition, I give this previous notice to any one who attempts to take advantage of Mr. Moore's present mental weakness, of the defense that will be made of his intellectual honesty and sincerity, and of his good name.

J. B. W.

The condition of Mr. Moore has improved some since last week we were glad to say. If he keeps on the improvement he should be able to edit the next edition on the Blade again in the next month.

INFIDEL ATTEMPTS

TO MAKE CHRIST OUT AN INFIDEL—DR. WILSON REPLIES
TO A LETTER FROM GEO.
W. MCCORMICK.

One of my particular and esteemed friends is George William McCormick of Olympia, Ky., late editor of the Rationalist. He is one of the most persistent and unflinching workers in the cause—faithful, tried and true in every adversity. He has ever been most generous, whether treated generously or not. He has been a good friend to me, and I wish here, publicly to express my appreciation. Bro. McCormick has long and deeply studied the religious and political affairs of mankind, and his views are worth the serious thought of thinking men. He expresses himself forcibly and plainly, and calls a spade a spade. He and I swap opinions now and then and if he thinks the wheels are going around in my brain-box, he don't hesitate to inform me about it. He tells me that I don't know what I am talking about at times, and I reckon he is right. A man who talks as much as I do, would be a wonder, if he was right all the time.

I received a letter from him the other day, in reply to one I had written to him several weeks previously. It seemed to me to furnish a good text, which I have indicated in the headline of this contribution, "Infidel attempts to make Christ out an infidel." It is subject I have been intending to write on for some time, and one not heretofore discussed. His letter, in part, is as follows:

My Dear Doctor:—

In reply to your much appreciated letter of September past, I want to look a little into your rather emphatic statement that "The Character Christ of the co-called New, or last will and written testament (of a fictitious God) had caused more war, more bloodshed, more ignorance, pain and suffering than has ever arisen from the acts and words of any one man or cause in all human history."

Now, he only statement charged to this character Christ that would lead to such an assertion, was "I came not to bring peace but a sword; I came to put husband against wife, brother against brother," etc. But, did not Tom Paine do the same? He, too, put men to thinking along new lines of thought—of equity, fellow fairness and human rights. Just as soon as Paine began spreading the ideas that there are no such things as divine rights of kings, priests and popes just that some father alone and his hands and wives, and neighbors and sections differed, and the sword was brought out an unsheathed, war followed, and the Tom Paine ideas seemed to win in America. But kinglyright with its co-called priestcraft still lived, and the moment you or I begin to write or talk for the practical idea of common sense, common rights, or Catholic equity, we find our wives standing against us, finding fault and fixed in the old time rut and prove of superstition—against the same damned, damnable and damaging superstition that Christ fought against, and was hung for, and that Paine fought against, until he was imprisoned and marked for the gallows.

So, if Christ did say he came to bring a sword, to cut away the superstition that entailed a religious despotism on the world, he meant no more, and did no more than Tom Paine. A true is known by its fruits and as a man should be judged generally by his acts, doings and sayings, and as Christ never took part in any war or personal muscular combat, and until you can point out some such act in that, it is not fair to brand a man as a warrior who was brave to death for opposing the prevailing idea of war and blood letting in his day.

So let me advise you once more to let up on calling priestcraft (which is man more or less the world over but the Roman Catholic religion) Christianity.

powers and principles of common utility. Government is at best and most only of the people's making—a necessary evil—a costly encumbrance, never any worse, better than the people who make it. All governments which own the people are monarchies. All people who own the government and make it their servant that is Republican, the first a curse, the second a blessing.

All wealth is measured by work, i. e., by the day's labor, and whoever has the financial craft and turn for acquisitiveness sufficient to acquire and lay by, store up, board and keep at his or her control ready money that person has wealth, and should such be taken from those who thus acquire it and turn it over to the government? Should such be done, the few will control the many. Individually, personal activity and the incentive for industry and of storing up will have passed from us and we would quickly drift into ignorance and squalor and the Tom Paine idea of Republican government would be gone.

Yours truly,
G. W. MCCORMICK.

Now that letter reads well. It has some sense in it—just SOME. It has light to the extent only of Brother McCormick's eye sight; but Bro. McCormick's vision is in the gloaming. The principal idea conveyed in it is the defense of Christ or the "Christ Character." Bro. McCormick is an Infidel—an Atheist I believe, and it is not an uncommon thing for co-called Infidels to defend Christ, and should say him with infidel reformers. Roseau, Paine and many of the prominent have done this. I think that much of this has been done to impress Christians with infidel fairness, and to show them that for the man Christ they have almost infinite respect. In thus taking such particular pains to do justice to the man, I think many Freethinkers have overstepped themselves. This includes Paine, who said that "for the Man Christ he had profound respect." I haven't. Some may think me conceited and pertinent thus to differ from Paine; but Paine, while knowing much, and fitting well his day, didn't know it all. Neither do I; but with the advantages of today's progress, I have almost infinite respect that Paine didn't know. So do school boys.

I respect much in Christ, or the Christ character—but when it comes to a "profound" respect, I approach with a degree of reserve and caution.

In the first place Christ openly proclaimed himself as the Son of God, the same as his Father, God on Earth. He pretended to be commissioned of God, bearing a message directly from him to all mankind. No matter how you may twist his words, that is these impressions left with his followers, who in their ignorance and superstition believed it, and who set about to preach it to all the world, and millions in the world still preach and believe it. Therefore, it must be taken as he gave it, literally.

We all now know that it is a ridiculous lie. Therefore on the very first claim or pretention of Christ, I cannot have any kind of respect, to say nothing of a "profound respect."

He was a tramp preacher and nothing else, so far as we have any history, and I have no respect for such characters. He didn't work and provide for himself. He let the women who got struck on his good appearance feed him. He was just the kind of parasite that under Socialism would have to go to work; for let it not be forgotten that under Socialism, the poor idler will have to go to work as well as the preacher, the stock gambler, and monopolist. It will fall harder on the lazy drone and on those who, like Christ and Dowry, go around living on their wit, or by proclaiming themselves divines and gods. All such will have to go to work.

Christ pretended to perform miracles. We all know that he was acting a lie—that he thus deceived the poor and ignorant, and left them in the belief of the deceit he practiced upon them; and the minds of millions still are groping in the delusions he floated upon the world. For this, I cannot have a "profound respect."

If such a person lived, no doubt all the good was not told about him, and neither was all the bad. Since both good and bad had been recorded of him, it follows that much of each has been left untold in the brief disconnected statements of his disciples.

Only a small part of his life has been recorded.

I have neither a profound nor an ordinary respect for the good, either in the character or teachings of Christ. In the first place, it is every man's simple duty, from a sense of decency and right to be good. I don't attach any great credit to a man who pretends to be a God, for being good, it ought to be easy for a God to be good. Besides when a man makes such pretensions, he must make goodness his business. I do have a profound respect, however, for the poor fellow, who makes no super claims to goodness, but who is bad naturally, and who continues trying to be good, even though he fail. I would rather have such a man for my savior than Christ, the sleight of hand performer, the conjurer, the plagiarist, false philosopher and pretender to divinity.

As above stated I have not a profound respect even for the wisest and best of Christ's teachings, for this simple reason: I have found them time for time and word for word in the teachings of reformers who preceded him, and who made no lying pretension to divinity. I believe Jesus Christ to have been, (admitting that he lived), a literary scavenger. I believe he stole his philosophy, which he gathered in the eighteen years in which he was missing.

Having picked up the teachings of Buddha and Confucius, he returned to the Jews just at a grievous time in their political history, and proclaimed himself the Messiah, for whose coming he knew they were anxiously looking. The time was opportune for sprouting this claim, and began spreading the doctrine he had imbibed, confounding the minds of the ignorant and stupid with his sleight of hand acquirements and hypocritical powers.

Do you wonder that vast crowds followed him about when the streets of Cincinnati were recently blocked with men and women seeking to touch the hem of Schlatzer's coat-tails? Can you wonder that he gained followers in those times of universal ignorance when Dowie to-day has a hundred thousand obedient serfs?

Compare the relations of Christ to the people, compare his methods of instruction with those of Socrates or Aristotle.

Why, right upon the face of his pretensions, any one with half perception ought to be able to see written in big letters FAKES.

No, I cannot go so far as Paline, and say I have "a profound respect for the 'Man' Christ, nor even for his moral precepts which are evidently borrowed. Nor can I go so far as Rousseau.

In my old school reader, long before I knew who Rousseau was, I used to read and was wonderfully impressed with a eulogy given by Rousseau concerning the "moral precepts of Christ and which ended this way:

"Socrates died like a philosopher, but Jesus Christ like a God."

The years ran by, and I learned who Rousseau was, and also learned that Christ, who had all the splendors and happiness of heaven before him, squatted at the last moment, while Socrates without such prospects, dignity, bravery, and dignity took the hemlock. I found that a reversal of the statement was the fact, and I have never had a profound respect even for Rousseau, infidel though he was. I don't like his prospects, and I don't like the facts about gods and saviors, as well as devils and fakes.

Bro. McCormick says that Christ never took part in any war or personal muscular combat. "Didn't he break in upon the money changers on a certain occasion, and raise all kinds of hades?" Neither did Machiavelli ever engage in war, but he was the high priest in teaching the art of war. Neither was Luther engaged in war, but the thirty years war resulted in his teachings. He may as well acquit Loyola of the Inquisition as acquit Christ of all the wars and bloodshed that followed the attempt to establish his doctrines.

Bro. McCormick says that "a man should be judged generally by his acts, doings and sayings."

I shall take him up on that statement. In case of Christ we are compelled to judge him chiefly by his "sayings," for certainly his "doings," which consisted of tramping around, praying, preaching and performing tricks—were not such as to commend themselves for imitation to-day. All one has to do, in order to perceive the vagabondage of Christ's existence, is to say to himself "Now suppose I leave my business or profession, and start out among the ignorant to preach and convince them by my ability to perform miracles." Does any one suppose that even the ordinary paid preacher of today would start out to imitate the "doings" of Christ? Would any one risk getting pulled by the police, or his head thumped by a disgusted crowd by stopping on a

crowded street, and having his feet wiped with the hair of the head of an ignorant woman who had made him believe that he was God Almighty?

The loss we say about the "doings" of Christ, the better for him. Let us judge him generally by his sayings, and by the general results of his sayings, as Bro. McCormick's proposition. I am surprised that Bro. McCormick inclines to excuse, defend and explain away the most cruel words that Christ ever uttered, "I came not to bring peace but a sword, to put a father against son, etc." No matter what Christ may have meant by them, his followers understood them literally, and he did not disabuse their minds. He left them with no other explanation. They took him at his word, and ever since have applied the sword when it was safe for them to do so. They found their justification for war, massacre, torture and the inquisition in these very force and fiery words.

Must Jesus Christ's teachings by the general effect they have had upon the human race. He said some good things and also some very bad things—and the selfish and powerful have ever chosen to be guided by the latter. Must Jesus Christ's teachings by the general effect they have had upon the human race. He said some good things and also some very bad things—and the selfish and powerful have ever chosen to be guided by the latter. Must Jesus Christ's teachings by the general effect they have had upon the human race. He said some good things and also some very bad things—and the selfish and powerful have ever chosen to be guided by the latter.

Since Jesus Christ's teachings by the general effect they have had upon the human race. He said some good things and also some very bad things—and the selfish and powerful have ever chosen to be guided by the latter. Must Jesus Christ's teachings by the general effect they have had upon the human race. He said some good things and also some very bad things—and the selfish and powerful have ever chosen to be guided by the latter.

The illustration Bro. McCormick draws from comparing the effect of the sayings of Christ with those of Paline, is not applicable. They have a similarity, after all, difference. The writings of Paline led to taking up the sword in the defense of freedom, and human rights and liberty; while the sayings of Christ led to taking up the sword in the defense of kingship and priestcraft. Some people believe that Christ's principal aim was to disabuse the old Jewish superstitions. I cannot see it that way. He opposed a few trivial matters of no great consequence to humanity. What he really effected was, to particularly knock out one superstition and establish a worse one. Bad as the history of the Jews was, as no time in all the history of Judaism was as disastatous as Christianity for a thousand years.

Christ and Christianity have perverted to the world. They have stood in opposition to all liberty and progress. Christ proclaimed himself to be God. He invented hell. He damned to everlasting fire all who did not believe in him. His representatives have done likewise. What is more ludicrous than for a Freethinker to try to patch him up and make him presentable for acceptance into infidel society. The tendency to be a growing tendency along this line among Freethinkers. They try to make out that he was, in reality an infidel reformer, because he opposed a few of the old Jewish superstitions. The fact is that the philosophy of Jesus is no improvement over that of Job and other old testament writers, and besides in declaring himself to be God Almighty, and trying to prove the same by legends, he demonstrated that he was equally fanatical and superstitious.

There was not enough infidel raw material in Jesus Christ to make a shadow of a Freethinker. For heaven's sake, let the Christians have him and keep him. Suppose, now, that it were possible for infidelity to prove and claim him as an infidel philosopher and reformer, as one who opposed the old order of things, and lost life in the doing. The moment we claim him for infidelity, that moment we must assume all his blunders and superstitions and vicious doctrines which have plunged the world in ignorance cruelty and bloodshed. Yes, you must see that as soon as we make an infidel out of him, the moral world would at once blame infidelity for the bad in him, for advocating the use of the sword, sending people to hell for their inability to believe, etc., etc.

Because Jesus Christ's religious fanaticism opposed other religious fanatics, that don't make an infidel or Freethinker out of him, even if he did get killed for it.

If a Roman Catholic Christian opposed a Greek Catholic Christian and the Roman Christian gets killed, he doesn't make a great infidel reformer out of him, does it? No! It is only dog eat dog.

This tendency of infidels to make an infidel out of Jesus is all due to nonsense. He was nothing else but either a religious crank, crack rail of conceit and divinity, or the most unmitigated pretender and charlatan that ever lived. A smart rascal who imbibed both the philosophy and the credomania of the East, and who came back and played it off on the ignorant Jews, hoodwinking them into the belief that he was the Messiah and the Son of God, just as Dowie to-day, in passing thousands believe that he is Elijah.

I have recently read the famous Jefferson Bible—3000 copies of which were recently printed by Congress. Jefferson had aimed to clip out all the New Testament passages by which directly bears upon the sayings and acts of Christ, and he declares that in this compilation there is the finest system of morals in all the world.

I don't think that Jefferson could be such an old fool. I was never so appointed in anything in my life. It is the weakest thing out. It starts off with all the claims of Jesus to divinity and embraces "the believe or be damned" declaration, and the "I came not to bring peace but a sword, etc." and all the other preposterous pretensions proclaimed by Jesus, and in this, is to be found "the finest system of morals in all the world." It starts to pretend to be a moral reformer, and then it goes on to show how he befuddled some infidels set in sizing up the character of Jesus Christ.

Even Ingersoll was a little weak on the man Jesus, whom he looked upon as a moral reformer, and to whom he said "paid the tribute of his tears." And even Bro. Moore, when he stood on Calvary, blubbered some of the brain, although he has ridiculed Christ's claim to divinity a thousand times, and otherwise devoted him an imposter and showed up his weakness and inconsistencies.

I can only explain this tendency by the sentiment imbibed in their youth, which still lingers in some infidels minds. After all, difference, the up of the Christ of their plastic child hood, and being now infidels, they somehow want to take Christ along with them, and so incline to make an infidel out of him. This is Bro. McCormick's delusion. He well knows that Jesus was deeply religious and a superstitious fanatic, and got his lights put out in a theological scrap, and by pretending that he was the Christ of the Jews whom the Jews in their ignorant superstition had been looking for. If one Indian killed another Indian over a matter of Indian theology, that wouldn't make a great infidel reformer out of him, would it? No! He would be only a dead Indian.

Neither would a superstitious Jew killed by another superstitious Jew be a great infidel reformer.

Bro. McCormick says that Christ said "I came not to bring peace but a sword, etc." in order to cut away against "the superstitious of the Jews." How does Bro. McCormick know that what Christ meant? Christ made no such mention as that. That is plain. Bro. McCormick's interpretation is a parody, for the saying which he made up at some desperate and perverted moment. The only interpretation any of us can justify put on that saying, must be founded on the results of the saying—and what are they? Why, their literal meaning—the application of the sword to establish his own doctrines, and his own fame as one of the delities of the world—to crush all other religions that his own might rise to supreme power. That, as Bro. McCormick knows, was the result of that saying, and no other interpretation can be put upon it.

And this is one of the items which Jefferson included as a part of "the finest system of morals in the world," and this is the "Man Christ," whom Rousseau and Paline had profound respect, and for whom Ingersoll and Moore paid "the tribute of their tears." Oh, Gosh!

The first thing that we know Christ will be the spiritual president of the American Spiritual Union to succeed the present worthy Poltemah.

And why should either the "God Christ" or the "Man Christ" come braying "Peace unto men," and then say, I came not to bring peace but a sword?

Why should we want to turn the sword even upon his own people, even to cut away their superstition," as Bro. McCormick says. What's there any better way? Why didn't this God Christ, or Man Christ try to enlighten argument first? Why did he

want to kill people either to down an old religion, or to establish his own?

Why should he want any man brought before him and stoned to death, who might deny him?

Suppose I would suddenly appear among an ignorant people, and thus try to overthrow their customs and religion, and get killed for it. What would all of you say to me?

"The damned fool ought to have had better sense," some of you would say; and others would say, "He ought to have been killed." Any man who advocates the use of the sword in settling religious disputes, ought to fall by the sword, Jesus got his deserts.

That is just what Bro. McCormick and all the rest of you would say if you knew why only all this "profound respect," and "tears" and infidel twaddle about Christ being an infidel reformer, or any other kind of a reformer, when we infidels all ought to know by this time that for 1600 years, in the New Testament, through rivers of blood to reform his reform, and we are still wading. What does liberty and peace in Russia mean, but the bloody struggle to get away from the God Christ or Man Christ, or whatever you may please to call it.

I don't take a back seat in my reverence for any man who has died for man, or who has died for a principle which tended to the betterment of mankind. I aim to be in the front row to do him honor. But I fail to see where Christ died for men, or for a principle which tended to the betterment and happiness of men.

I fail to see here he died for liberty of thought and speech, and education and progressive, liberal government. I fail to see wherein he died, except to introduce a sword to knock out one superstition for the purpose of establishing another, which proved the most dangerous use of the sword, the ever existed, and which every lover of justice and progress, even at this late day, is compelled to contend against.

I am not going to make a martyr out of a man who falsely pretended to be a God, and who died as the result of contending over some superstitious schemes, and trying to make a divinity of himself; and I am going to rap every infidel on the pate who tries to make an infidel reformer out of him. We don't want him. He was a miracle worker. Let the believers in miracles have him. We don't want to chase after either a God, Christ or a Man Christ, who spent valuable time in trying to devise a religion, instead of explaining the laws of the universe.

I think it ought to be plain to all by this time that it wasn't upon the good things that Christ said that his religion was founded, but rather the most subtle and cruel of all the evils, the equivocal, the dictatorial and impious.

If his religion had been influenced by the good and true things he said, we would never have had the wars, massacres, murders, inquisitions, tortures, kings and other cruelties that have existed and been committed in his name. As Bro. McCormick says: "We must judge him GENERALLY by his sayings and doings," and that's just what I'm doing. There is no way to judge him, but to judge him generally. Christians want you to see all the good and none of the bad in him, and even some infidels would apologize for his worst teachings. If Bro. McCormick would apologize for Christ's relations to Mary Magdalene, wouldn't find the least fault. I would say, and we all human, and all weak, and but few of us have any right to expect a man to be infidel over the whole, when he deliberately apologizes for Christ's cold, heartless advocacy of the use of the sword, whether it be to destroy another superstition or to advance his own, then I must hold him bad judgment up where he and all can see, and be ashamed of it. But I am not writing this alone for Bro. McCormick's benefit. I am taking a rap at Paline, Rousseau, Jefferson, Ingersoll, Moore, and thousands of others, who profound respect and tears, and fool apologies, and lick spitting over this "Man Christ" make me sick. I deny that he was either a good God or a good man.

Bro. McCormick says "God Christ" or "Man Christ" whatever he was, with the greatest of all crimes—that of pretending to be a God—of deceiving the wise by a plagiarized philosophy; of deceiving the ignorant by legends of eternal life, and hell, and of advocating the use of the sword in order to destroy other beliefs and to establish his own; of promulgating the doctrines of the divine right of kings, of eternal damnation, of eternal hell, and of the eternal of women; all of which general devil had the result of fitting the world with war, massacre, murder, hate, revenge, ignorance, brutality and general retrogradation. Of all crimes, the most heinous crime against humanity. Unfortunately the Jews killed this vain, bigoted and conceited pretender, this conjurer of the good and bad; otherwise, the world would never have been cursed either with him or with his teachings.

Both at his trial and crucifixion, Christ had the chance to square himself; but he went to his death still maintaining that he was God and without retracting any of his deceits. It is not improbable that he saw that if he told the truth they would kill him anyhow for his false pretension of being the Messiah, and so, died as he has lived. He must have known that the Jewish people were in a bad fix politically, under the Romans, and they were not in a mood to stand any trifling from PROCLAM. SIX—WILSON

tenders, moral, spiritual or temporal to the throne. To have confessed that he was not what he had pretended to be would have meant death to him anyhow. Those old Jewish rulers were no fools. They could come as near telling a God when they saw him as you or I.

The most charitable thing that can be said of Christ is that he was in fact, a very common species of insanity in that which seeks and courts martyrdom, especially when the governing impulsion is religion. I believe that to-day Dowie would be planned to the cross for the notoriety it would gain him in the future; and with his last dying gasp, he would say, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do, they know not that I am Libe."

Bro. McCormick advises me to "let up on calling priestcraft, or in other words the Roman Catholic religion—Christianity."

I won't do it. If the Catholic religion is not Christianity, there is no Christianity. It is pretended to be a Christian I would be a Catholic. The Catholic religion is the only consistent religion. It is the only one that has interpreted Christ correctly. It was the first to begin, and will be the last to end. It is the only one that has the divine right of kings, the exercise of faith over reason, and all the practices of the miraculous and sleight of hand and other hocus pocus indulged in by Christ. If Catholicism isn't consistent Christianity, I don't know what is.

All the Protestant creeds are but expressions of man's struggling to get away from Christianity. They are few bottom runs in the long sprint of infidelity.

I have now dwelt at such great length on this part of Bro. McCormick's letter that I will not have time to discuss the economic part, but will speak briefly of my mental. He says that Bill Bryan, Tom Watson and Doc Wilson, as well as nearly all the rest of the present day human animals are suffering delusion as to the municipal ownership of all the powers of common utility—meaning I suppose, public ownership of railroads, telegraphs, mines, lands, etc.

Well "animals" have more sense than men in the things that most affect them, and in my opinion it is a sad and growing sign of the times when the animals get aroused. All the reforms that have come to the world have been wrought by the animals. When have gods, saviors, kings, priests, nabobs, landowners, monopolists and aristocrats ever inaugurated a reform, or stood for common laws, justice and humanity?

In Russia only two people in a hundred were allowed to be educated, and even these were limited in their studies.

All the rest were animals. The animals are aroused. At this writing they are making particular hell. They are demanding the disenthronement of Czar and Pope, and the establishment of a Democracy. As the animals are evidently from the extreme of Catholicism to the extreme of Atheism and eventually become the most liberal country in the world, likewise will the Russian animal change. In twenty years Russia will be one of the greatest among the liberal people of the world. Mark well what I say. If the animals keep their courage until they kill the Romanoffs, and the nobility and great land owners clear out of the country, they, the animals, will make Russia the most glorious country in the world.

Brother McCormick farther says: "All wealth is measured by work." No such thing. Lots of people inherit millions who never worked a day in their lives. Lots of people own land, who would never have had it if their grand-fathers hadn't worked for it and give it to them. The people who work the hardest are generally the poorest, so all wealth is not measured by work.

What he meant was that it takes work to produce wealth. But there is a big difference between "measuring wealth by work" and "producing wealth by work."

You wouldn't "measure" Rockefeller's billion by his "work" would you? No, you wouldn't. Why? His scheming, thieving and corrupting and by his cold, cruel and sneaking selfishness. He is the kind who believes like Christ, in using the sword.

for acquiescence (Morgan, Gould, Hill, Seale) sufficient to acquire and lay by, store up, hoard and keep at his or her control ready money—that person has wealth, and should such be taken from those who thus acquire it, and turned over to the government.

My reply to this is: It is all according to what he means by "financial graft." If he refers to the graft of monopoly and legislation, I say that all such graft should be taken from the grafters and returned as far as possible to the rightful owners, the government seize the rest and forever after stop grafting. Of course the government should seize all the coal mines and oil fields. The owners didn't put the oil there or the coal there. They didn't make it. It is a common public necessity. Why should a few own it? If the government would now seize all the Standard Oil wells, I expect Rockefeller would have to go enough to live on the rest of his life.

You wouldn't "measure" George Gould's wealth by his "work" would you? He didn't make his railroads. He didn't work on them. They were given to him by his father, who was one of the biggest thieves, criminals and rascals that ever lived and who like Rockefeller, ought to have been sent to the penitentiary.

If the government would take up all of Gould's railroads, I expect Gould would have enough bonds, property and cash to live on. I am sure he would have a great deal more "wealth" than equalled his "work."

It is all a matter of how a man gets his money—how he acquires it—whether his wealth is equal to the labor he performs, or whether it is measured by injustice, inhumanity and crime.

The man who honestly works for what he gets, and lays it up on boards, of course has the right to do so. That is just the kind of man that every man should be. But the man, who by the present system of corruption lays up millions, I say that man has no right to acquire and hoard his ill gotten gains.

Were I president, and had it in my power to take it from them, and turn it over to the government, would I do it? You just bet I would.

Men have no more right to hoard money in that way than they have to board thought. What would you think of a man who had a genius for invention, mathematics, music, poetry, art or science, and who would hoard it up and lay it by for his own selfish satisfaction?

Every man who has the love of humanity in his heart owes it to himself to give a large part of the best of himself, the best of his thought, the best of his kindness and love, and his strength and ability, to help him, whom nature has not so bountifully endowed, and whose environment have placed them at unequal advantages in the race of life.

Money is not the only wealth—of social position not the only aristocracy. There is an aristocracy of character, of the mind; and to me, a poor starved, half naked Russian serf, like Maxim Gorky, is worth more than all the crowned idols and noble lords, and thieving rascals in the world, and I don't want to trade such good "animals" longer abused.

In each case of municipal ownership which has come under my observation, the government or municipality has invariably remunerated all property holders for the property confiscated, for the general good, and the remuneration has always been generous. There is no disposition to take any man's lands or property away from him without remuneration.

Consequently all the fear of the inhabitants of remote parts, like Groh, Lou Lawrence, Moore and McCormick, is only night how. None of them understand the general economic conditions, or municipal ownership, or the Standard Oil questions. They are all in now on the subject of Standard Oil, and if I ever get time I am going to reply and give them all the squirm I get.

This is a long article, but Hughes is complaining that he has no copy to fill the Blade, and this will help him to fill his columns if it does no other good.

Again to Bro. McCormick and to all infidels who thoughtlessly try to make an infidel reformer out of Christ, I will say that it is a waste of good time to try to renovate and disabuse the minds of such general sayings and doings, have produced such generally unhappy results—the plunging of the world into thousands of years of ignorance, superstition, cruelty and crime. It is a character not worth disabusing. Why? His scheming, thieving and corrupting and by his cold, cruel and sneaking selfishness. He is the kind who believes like Christ, in using the sword.

This Brother McCormick further asks me to make the Blade an up-to-date weekly Freethought paper.